AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application. Please amend Claims 1-4, 8-21, 45-48, 50-54, 56-57, 60, and 62-70 as follows:

1.   (Currently Amended) A method for determining if ~~a server~~ an agent should be assigned to ~~a server~~ an agent pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the ~~server~~ agent pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~ agents that process work of the work type, comprising:

5   determining if ~~a server's~~ an agent's first value for the work type is less than ~~a server's~~ an agent's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's negative indicator for the work type;

determining a composite preference value for the work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's first

10   value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type;

determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent is suitable for assignment to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the composite preference value

15   for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type.

2.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein determining the composite preference value comprises:

determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to

5   have servers perform work of the work type;

accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to determine a composite preference value; and

providing the ~~server's~~ agent's determined preference value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable

10   composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

3.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the ~~server's~~ agent's determined preference value for the work type to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

4.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the ~~server's~~ agent's determined preference value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server~~ agent first value;

5   multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled ~~server~~ agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

5.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

6.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

7.   (Original) The method of claim 2 wherein the determined dynamic preference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work

type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer

delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment rate for

5   the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

8.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the ~~server~~ agent is at

least one of a human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the accessed composite preference

value function is further configured to generate the composite preference value using data

associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

9.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further including not assigning

the ~~server~~ agent to the ~~server~~ agent pool of the work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value

is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value unless the composite preference value for the

work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type.

10.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the ~~server's~~ agent's first

value for the work type and the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type are retained

in a table and wherein determining if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less

than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type further comprises examining the

5   table to retrieve the ~~server's~~ agent's first value and the ~~server's~~ agent's second value.

11.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further including not

determining the composite preference value if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work

type is greater than or equal to the ~~server's~~ agent's second value.

12.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further including the work

processing facility receiving the indication and assigning the ~~server~~ agent to the ~~server~~ agent

pool of the work type as a back-up server.

13. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising:

re-determining the composite preference value for the work type;

determining if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value; and

5   sending another indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent should be removed from the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value.

14. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein determining if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's second value is determined a plurality of times, the method further comprising:

examining an evaluation parameter to determine if the determination of whether the

5   ~~server's~~ agent's first value exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's second value should be determined for another time of the plurality of times.

15. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the work processing facility has a plurality of ~~server~~ agent pools for a plurality of work types and wherein a composite preference value is determined for each work type of the plurality of work types if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for that work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for that work type.

16. (Currently Amended) A method for determining if ~~a server~~ an agent should be assigned to at least one ~~server~~ agent pool of a plurality of ~~server~~ agent pools in a work processing facility that processes work for a plurality of work types, each ~~server~~ agent pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~ agents that process work of a respective work

5   type of the plurality of work types, comprising:

for at least one work type of the plurality of work types:

determining if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the ~~server's~~

10   agent's negative indicator for the work type;

determining a composite preference value for the work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type;

determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type

15   is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent is suitable for assignment to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type.

17.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 16, further comprising:

determining for which ~~server~~ agent pools the ~~server~~ agent has been assigned, wherein determining if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type is performed only if the ~~server~~ agent is not assigned to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type.

18.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 16 wherein determining if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type is performed for all work types of the plurality of work types for which the ~~server~~ agent has not been assigned to the respective ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type.

19.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 16 wherein determining the composite preference value comprises:

determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to

5   have ~~servers~~ agents perform work of the work type;

accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to determine a composite preference value; and

providing the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable

10   composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

20.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 19 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

21.   (Currently Amended) The method of claim 19 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server~~ agent first value;

5   multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled ~~server~~ agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

22.   (Original) A method for determining in a call center if an agent should be assigned to an agent pool for a work type processed by the call center, the agent pool configured to retain an indication of agents that process work of the work type, comprising:

determining if an agent's first value for the work type is less than an agent's second

5   value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the agent's positive indicator for the

work type and the second value indicates the agent's negative indicator for the work type;

determining a composite preference value for the work type if the agent's first value

for the work type is less than the agent's second value for the work type;

determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater

10   than the agent's second value for the work type; and

sending an indication to a work distributor in the call center that the agent is suitable

for assignment to the agent pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the

work type is greater than the agent's second value for the work type.

23.   (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein determining the composite

preference value comprises:

determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined

dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the call center's need to have agents

5   perform work of the work type;

accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to

determine a composite preference value; and

providing the agent's determined first value for the work type and the determined

dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable composite

10   preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

24.   (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the accessed user-selectable

composite preference value function comprises:

adding the agent's determined first value for the work type to the determined dynamic

preference value for the work type.

25.   (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the agent's determined first value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled agent first value;

5   multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

26.   (Original) The method of claim 25 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

27.   (Original) The method of claim 25 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

28.   (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the determined dynamic preference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment

5   rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

29.   (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the agent is at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the accessed composite preference value function is further configured to generate the composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

30.   (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein the agent's first value for the work type and the agent's second value for the work type are retained in a table and wherein determining if the agent's first value for the work type is less than the agent's second value for the work type further comprises examining the table to retrieve the agent's first value and the agent's second value.

31.   (Original) The method of claim 22, further including the work distributor receiving the indication and assigning the agent to the agent pool of the work type as a back-up agent.

32.   (Original) The method of claim 22, further comprising:

re-determining the composite preference value for the work type;

determining if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the agent's second value; and

sending another indication to the work distributor that the agent should be removed from the agent pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the agent's second value.

33.   (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein the call center has a plurality of agent pools for a plurality of work types, and wherein:

a composite preference value is determined for each work type of the plurality of work types if the agent's first value for that work type is less than the agent's second value for that work type.

34.   (Original) A method for determining in a work distributor if a server should be assigned to a server pool for a work type to which the work distributor assigns servers, the

server pool configured to retain an indication of servers that process work of the work type, comprising:

5   determining if a server's first value for the work type is less than the server's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the server's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the server's negative indicator for the work type;

    determining a composite preference value for the work type if the server's first value for the work type is less than the server's second value for the work type;

10   determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the server's second value for the work type; and

    assigning the server to the server pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the server's second value for the work type.

  35. (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein determining the composite preference value comprises:

    determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of a work processing facility's need to have

5   servers perform work of the work type;

    accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to determine a composite preference value; and

    providing the server's determined preference value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable

10   composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

  36. (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the server's determined preference value for the work type to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

37.   (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the server's determined preference value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled server first value;

5   multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled server first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

38.   (Original) The method of claim 37 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

39.   (Original) The method of claim 37 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

40.   (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the determined dynamic reference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment rate for 5   the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

41.   (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the server is at least one of human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the accessed composite preference value function is

further configured to generate the composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

42.   (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein the server is not assigned the server pool of the work type if the server's first value is less than the server's second value unless the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the server's second value for the work type.

43.   (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein the server's first value for the work type and the server's second value for the work type are retained in a table and wherein determining if the server's first value for the work type is less than the server's second value for the work type further comprises examining the table to retrieve the server's first value and the server's second value.

44.   (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein the assigned server is designated as a back-up server in the server pool and wherein back-up servers in the server pool are configured for removal from the server pool by the work

45.   (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to determine if ~~a server~~ an agent should be assigned to ~~a server~~ an agent pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the ~~server~~ agent pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~ agents that process work of the work type, by performing the steps of:

determining if ~~a server's~~ an agent's first value for the work type is less than ~~a server's~~ an agent's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's negative indicator for the work type;

-13-

10   determining a composite preference value for the work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's first

value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type;

determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater

than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent is suitable

15   for assignment to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the composite preference value

for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type.

46.   (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 45 wherein

determining the composite preference value comprises:

determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined

dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to

5   have ~~servers~~ agents perform work of the work type;

accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to

determine a composite preference value; and

providing the ~~server's~~ agent's determined preference value for the work type and the

determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable

10   composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work

type.

47.   (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 46 wherein

the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the ~~server's~~ agent's determined preference value for the work type to the

determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

48.   (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 46 wherein

the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server~~ agent first value;

5   multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled ~~server~~ agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

49.   (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 46 wherein the determined dynamic preference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the

5   work type, a call abandonment rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

50.   (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 45, further comprising:

re-determining the composite preference value for the work type;

determining if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is

5   greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value; and

sending another indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent should be removed from the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value.

51.   (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 45 wherein determining if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's second value is determined a plurality of times, the computer-readable medium further comprising:

-15-

examining an evaluation parameter to determine if the determination of whether the

5 ~~server's~~ agent's first value exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's second value should be determined

for another time of the plurality of times.

52. (Currently Amended) A system for determining if ~~a server~~ an agent should

be assigned to ~~a server~~ an agent pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the ~~server~~

agent pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~ agents that process work of the work

type, comprising:

5 a first comparator configured to determine if ~~a server's~~ an agent's first value for the

work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type, wherein the first

value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's positive indicator for the work type and the second value

indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's negative indicator for the work type;

a second comparator configured to determine a composite preference value for the

10 work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's

second value for the work type;

a third comparator configured to determine if the determined composite preference

value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type;

and

15 a result indicator configured to send an indication to the work processing facility that

the ~~server~~ agent is suitable for assignment to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the

composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value

for the work type.

53. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the third comparator

comprises:

a determiner configured to determine a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to have ~~servers~~ agents perform work of the work type.

54.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 53 wherein the third comparator further includes:

a processor configured to provide the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to a user-selectable composite preference value function configured to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

55.   (Original) The system of claim 54 wherein the third comparator further includes:

a function provider that provides the user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to generate the composite preference value.

56.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 54 wherein the processor is configured to perform the operations of a user-selectable composite preference value function that adds the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

57.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 54 wherein the processor is configured to perform the operations of a user-selectable composite preference value function that multiplies the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server~~ agent first value, multiplies the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value, and adds the scaled ~~server~~ agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value.

-17-

58.　(Original) The system of claim 57 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

59.　(Original) The system of claim 57 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

60.　(Currently Amended) The system of claim 54 wherein the ~~server~~ agent is at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the processor in executing the user-selectable composite value function is further configured to determine a composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

61.　(Original) The system of claim 53 wherein the determiner is configured to determine a dynamic preference value for the work type from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

62.　(Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the result indicator is configured to indicate that the ~~server~~ agent should not be assigned to the ~~server~~ agent pool of the work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's preference value is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value unless the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value for the work type.

63.　(Currently Amended) The system of claim 52, further including a table retaining the ~~server's~~ agent's preference value for the work type and the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value for the work type, and wherein the first comparator is further configured to

-18-

examine the table to retrieve the ~~server's~~ agent's preference value and the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value.

64.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the second comparator is configured not to determine the composite preference value if the ~~server's~~ agent's preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value.

65.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the second comparator is configured to re-determine the composite preference value for the work type, the system further comprising:

a fourth comparator that is configured to determine if the re-determined composite

5   preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value; and

a second result indicator that is configured to send another indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent should be removed from the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value.

66.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the first comparator is configured to determine whether the ~~server's~~ agent's preference value exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value a plurality of times, the system further comprising:

a timer that examines an evaluation parameter to determine if the determination of

5   whether the ~~server's~~ agent's preference value exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value should be re-determined for another time of the plurality of times.

67.   (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the work processing facility has a plurality of ~~server~~ agent pools for a plurality of work types and wherein the second comparator is further configured to determine a composite preference value for each

work type of the plurality of work types if the ~~server's~~ agent's preference, value for that work

5   type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's threshold value for that work type.

68.   (Currently Amended) A computer memory containing ~~server~~ agent data usable for assigning ~~a server~~ an agent to ~~a server~~ an agent pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the data structure comprising an ordered series of entries each corresponding to the ~~server's~~ agent's positive indicator for the work type and the ~~server's~~

5   agent's negative indicator for the work type, a value of each entry in the ordered series indicating the relative extent to which the ~~server~~ agent prefers to receive work for the work type and to which the ~~server~~ agent prefers not to receive work for the work type, such that the value of the entries may be used to assign the ~~server~~ agent to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type.

69.   (Currently Amended) The data structure of claim 68, further comprising an entry corresponding to a composite preference value for the work type indicating the relative extent to which the work processing facility's preference for the ~~server~~ agent receiving work of the work type exceeds the ~~server's~~ agent's negative indicator for not receiving work for the work type.

70.   (Currently Amended) The data structure of claim 69 wherein a value for the entry corresponding to composite preference value for the work type equals a value for the ~~server's~~ agent's position for the work type and a value for a dynamic preference for the work type that reflects the work processing facility's preference for having the ~~server~~ agent perform the work type.

71.   (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type, comprising:

-20-

determining if a server's work value for the work type is one of less than a threshold value or equal to the threshold value, wherein the work value represents an inclination to

5   performing work of the work type; and

determining a composite work value for the work type if the server's work value for the work type is one of less than the threshold value or equal to the threshold value.

72.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein determining the composite work value for the work type comprises locating a previously calculated composite work value for the work type in a memory.

73.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein the server is one server of a plurality of servers and wherein at least another server of the plurality of servers uses the threshold value for the work type.

74.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein the server is one server of a plurality of servers and wherein at least another server of the plurality of servers uses the threshold value.

75.   (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

comparing the server's work value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type, wherein the

5   work value represents an inclination for performing work of the work type;

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type;

-21-

10   comparing a composite work value for the work type to the threshold value if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should not be assigned to process work items having the work type; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work type if comparing the composite work value

15   for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type.

76.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 75 wherein comparing the server's work value for the work type to the threshold value comprises determining if the server's work value for the work type is one of less than the threshold value or equal to the threshold value.

77.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 75 wherein comparing the composite work value for the work type to the threshold value comprises determining if the composite work value for the work type at least equals the threshold value.

78.   (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server should be assigned to process a work item having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

determining if a server's work value for the work type is one of less than a threshold

5   value or equal to the threshold value, wherein the work value represents an inclination to performing work of the work type;

determining a composite work value for the work type if the server's work value for the work type is less than the threshold value;

determining if the determined composite work value for the work type is greater than

10   the threshold value; and

-22-

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work type if the composite work value for the work type is greater than the threshold value.

79.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work processing facility contains a plurality of servers and wherein assigning work items to at least another server uses the threshold value.

80.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work processing facility processes a plurality of work items having a plurality of work types and wherein the threshold value corresponds to the work type.

81.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work processing facility contains a plurality of server pools, such that each work type has a corresponding server pool, and wherein sending the indication to the work processing facility results in the server's assignment to a server pool.

82.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein determining if the server's work value for the work type is less than a threshold value occurs when the server completes another work item.

83.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the server is a server in a plurality of servers and wherein determining if the server's work value for the work type is less than a threshold value occurs when another server of the plurality of servers is unavailable to process the work item.

84.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work item comprises a plurality of work attributes and wherein the work type represents a concatenation of the plurality of work attributes.

85.   (Previously Presented) A method of attaining enterprise objectives in a work processing facility that uses a user-selectable composite preference value function in assigning servers to process work items related to the enterprise objectives, comprising:

determining that the selected user-selectable composite preference value function

5   fails to optimize attainment of the enterprise objectives, wherein the selected user-selectable composite preference value function determines a composite preference value associated with the servers processing of work items;

examining a plurality of user-selectable composite preference value functions to identify another user-selectable composite preference value function; and

10   selecting the another user-selectable composite preference value function.

86.   (Previously Presented) A method of attaining a plurality of enterprise objectives in a work processing facility having a plurality of servers, wherein each enterprise objective has a priority, comprising:

characterizing work items according to at least one associated enterprise objective;

5   and

allocating the plurality of servers to process the work items on the basis of each work item's associated enterprise objective priority and each server's priority for processing a work item.

87.   (Previously Presented) The method of claim 86 wherein each enterprise objective also has an associated goal and wherein an enterprise objective's priority rises with

respect to the non-attainment of the enterprise objective's goal relative to the non-attainment of at least another enterprise objective's goal.

88.   (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server of a plurality of servers associated with an enterprise should be assigned to process a work item of a plurality of work items having a plurality of work types to achieve the enterprise's objectives, comprising:

5   determining at least one composite preference value for a server of the plurality of servers for a work type of the plurality of work types using a composite preference value function that combines the server's preferences for the work type and the enterprise's preferences for the work type;

          determining if the composite preference value function produces composite

10   preference values that achieve the enterprise's objectives; and

          locating another composite preference value function if the composite preference value function fails to achieve the enterprise's objectives.

89.   (Previously Presented) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to determine if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type, comprising:

          determining if a server's work value for the work type is one of less than a threshold

5   value or equal to the threshold value, wherein the work value represents an inclination to performing work of the work type; and

          determining a composite work value for the work type if the server's work value for the work type is one of less than the threshold value or equal to the threshold value.

90. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to determine if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

comparing the server's work value for the work type to a threshold value to determine

5 if the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type, wherein the work value represents an inclination for performing work of the work type;

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process

10 work items having the work type;

comparing a composite work value for the work type to the threshold value if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should not be assigned to process work items having the work type; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for

15 assignment to process work items of the work type if comparing the composite work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type.

91. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to attain a plurality of enterprise objectives in a work processing facility having a plurality of servers, wherein each enterprise objective has a priority, comprising:

5 characterizing work items according to at least one associated enterprise objective; and

allocating the plurality of servers to process the work items on the basis of each work item's associated enterprise objective priority and each server's priority for processing a work item.

-26-

92.   (Previously Presented) A system that assigns a server to process work having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

a first comparator configured to compare a server's first value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type,

5   wherein the first value indicates the server's inclination for performing work of the work type;

a second comparator configured to determine a composite preference value for the work type and compare the determined composite preference value for the work type to the threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type;

10   and

a result indicator configured to send an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type if at least one of the first comparator or the second comparator determines that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type.

93.   (Previously Presented) The system of claim 92, further comprising:
a threshold value calculator configured to calculate the threshold value.

94.   (Previously Presented) A system that assigns a plurality servers to process work items having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

at least one first comparator configured to compare a server's first value for a work item's work type to a threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to

5   the work item, wherein the first value indicates the server's inclination for performing work of the work type;

at least one second comparator configured to determine a composite preference value for the work type and compare the determined composite preference value for the work type

-27-

to the threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to work of the

10   work type; and

a result indicator configured to send an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type if at least one of the first comparator or the second comparator determines that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type.

95.   (Previously Presented) The system of claim 94 wherein the at least one first comparator and the at least one second comparator are associated with a first computer, the system further comprising:

at least another first comparator associated with a second computer, wherein the at

5   least another first comparator is configured to compare another server's first value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the another server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type, wherein the first value indicates the another server's inclination for performing work of the work type; and

at least another second comparator associated with a second computer, wherein the

10   at least another second comparator is configured to determine a composite preference value for the work type and compare the determined composite preference value for the work type to the threshold value to determine if the another server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type.

96.   (Previously Presented) The system of claim 94, further comprising:

a resource limiter configured to receive a maximum server total for the work type and further configured to prevent the server's assignment to the work type if assignment of the server to the work type exceeds the received maximum server total.

-28-